



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/625,774	07/26/2000	Mark Ira Crohn	MIC001	7874

7590 08/05/2005
Mark I Crohn
109 2nd St S #429
Kirkland, WA 98033

EXAMINER

SHAH, NILESH R

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2195

DATE MAILED: 08/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/625,774

Applicant(s)

CROHN, MARK IRA

Examiner

Nilesh Shah

Art Unit

2195

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 May 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) 2-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 2-21 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - a. A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
3. Claims 2-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Matoba et al (5,479,343) (hereinafter Matoba) in view of Miller (6,101,481).
4. As per claim 2, Matoba teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a computer-implemented system for automating a sequence of tasks comprising object model components, including:

an action date component having an associated date property that specifies a point in time, an action component having an associated task (col. 16 lines 55-66; col. 7 lines 38-55; col. 62 lines 30-48);

means for associating an instance of the action component with an instance of the action date component (col. 7 lines 38-55); and

means for executing the task associated with the instance of the action component based on the point in time specified in the date property of the instance of the action date component to which the instance of the action component is associated (col. 20 lines 55-65).

5. Matoba does not specifically teach the use of making the component aware of the other component's properties.

Miller teaches the association of a component with another component includes making the component aware of the other component such that the component can access certain of the properties, methods or events associated with the other component (col. 1 lines 47-52; col. 2 lines 5-9; col. 2 lines 58-61). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Miller and Matoba because Miller's method of updating information related each component and notifying the other component would improve Matoba system by allowing each component to know the status and other information about the other component.

6. As per claim 3, Matoba teaches a system wherein the instance of the action date component is a parent action date component and another instance of the action date component is a child action date component, the system further comprising of means for setting the point in time specified in the date property of the child action date component by offsetting from the point in time specified in the date property of the parent action date

by an offset value associated with the child action date component (col. 16 lines 55-66; col. 7 lines 38-55).

Miller teaches means for associating the child action date component with the parent action date component(col. 1 lines 47-52; col. 2 lines 5-9; col. 2 lines 58-61).

7. As per claim 4, Matoba teaches a system where in the object model components include an action list component, the system further comprising:
means for associating an instance of the action list component with at least one of the instances of the action date component; means for associating each instance of the action component with at least one instance of the action list component, thereby associating each instance of the action component with the instance of the action date component with which the instance of the action list is associated (col. 17 lines 27 –56); and
means for executing the task associated with the instance of the action component based on the point in time specified in the date property of the instance of the action date with which the instance of the action list component is associated (col. 62 lines 30-48).
8. As per claim 5, Matoba teaches a system wherein the instance of the action date component is a parent action date component and another instance of the action date component is a child action date component, the system further comprising means for associating the child action date component with the instance of the action list component, thereby associating the child action date component with the parent action

date component with which the instance of the action list is associated (col. 35 lines 4-59; col. 17 lines 27 –56);

means for setting the point in time specified in the date property of the child action date component by offsetting from the point in time specified in the date property of the parent action date by an offset value associated with the child action date component (col. 20 lines 55-65; col. 35 lines 40-59).

9. As per claim 6, Matoba teaches a system further comprising means for associating an instance of the action list component with another instance of the action list component (col. 17 lines 27 –56).

10. As per claim 7, Matoba teaches a system wherein there are a plurality of action list components associated with a parent component, the system further comprising:
means for grouping the action list components associated with the parent component according to context (col. 20 lines 55-65; col. 17 lines 27 –56) and
means for executing the action list components associated with the parent component based on an occurrence of the associated context (col. 20 lines 55-65; col. 35 lines 40-59).

11. Claim 8 is rejected based on the same rejection as claim 2 above.

12. As per claim 9, Matoba teaches a method further comprising:

providing a graphical user interface having, a graphic representation of the action date object and a graphic representation of the action object (fig 43; fig 44; col. 18 –lines 30-50; col. 17 lines 27 –56);

generating an instance of the action date object when the graphic representation of the action date object is select the instance of the action date object having a corresponding graphic representation of the instance of the action date object displayed in the graphical user interface; generating an instance of the action object when the graphic representation of the action object is selected, the instance of the action object having a corresponding graphic representation of the instance of the action object displayed in the graphical user interface (col. 20 lines 48-60; col.48 lines 52-62);

assembling a bolt that graphically represents the automated task fist by associating the graphic representation of the instance of the action object with the graphic representation of the action date object by way of the graphical user interface (col. 18 –lines 30-50; col. 17 lines 27 –56).

13. As per claim 10, Matoba teaches a method wherein the bolt is displayed in the graphical user interface as a checklist (col. 17 lines 27 –56; col. 18 –lines 30-50).

14. As per claim 11, Matoba teaches a method wherein the object model includes an action list object, the method further comprising associating an instance of the action list object with the instance of the action date object (col. 20 lines 48-60; col.48 lines 52-62); and

associating the instance of the action object with the instance of the action list object, thereby associating the instance of the action object with the instance of the action date object through the action list object col. 16 lines 55-66; col. 7 lines 38-55).

15. As per claim 12, Matoba teaches a method of further comprising: providing a graphical user interface having a graphic representation of the action date object, a graphic representation of the action list object a graphic representation of the action object; and generating an instance of the action date object when the graphic representation of the action date object is selected, the instance of the action date object having a corresponding graphic representation of the instance of the action date object displayed in the graphical user interface(fig 43; fig 44; col. 18 –lines 30-50; col. 17 lines 27 –56); generating an instance of the action list object when the graphic representation of the action list object is selected, the instance of the action list object having a corresponding graphic representation of the instance of the action list object displayed in the graphical user interface (col. 18 –lines 30-50; col. 17 lines 27 –56) generating an instance of the action object when the graphic representation of the action object is selected, the instance of the action object having a corresponding graphic representation of the instance of the action object displayed in the graphical user interface (fig 43; fig 44; col. 18 –lines 30-50; col. 17 lines 27 –56).

16. As per claim 13, Matoba teaches a method wherein the bolt is displayed in the graphical user interface as a checklist (col. 17 lines 27 –40).

17. As per claim 14, Matoba teaches a method further comprising of grouping the action list objects associated with the action date object according to context, wherein the graphic representation of the action date object includes a associated with each context and associating the graphic representation of the instance, of the action list object with a context by attaching the instance of the action list object with the region associated with the context by way of the graphical interface (fig 43; fig 44; col. 18 –lines 30-50; col. 17 lines 27 –40).
18. As per claim of Claim 15, Matoba teaches a method further comprising:
storing the automated task list as a constituent automated task list and assembling a parent automated task list from at least one constituent automated to task list by associating that constituent automated task list with the parent automated task list (col. 20 lines 55-65; col. 35 lines 40-59).
19. As per claim 16, Matoba teaches a method further comprising: providing a graphic representation in the graphical user interface of the constituent automated task list as a constituent bolt generating an instance of the constituent bolt when the graphic representation of the constituent bolt is selected, the instance of the constituent bolt having a corresponding graphic representation of the instance of the constituent bolt displayed in the graphical user interface(fig 43; fig 44; col. 18 –lines 30-50; col. 17 lines 27 –40);and

assembling a parent bolt that graphically represents the parent automated task list by graphically associating the graphic representation of the instance of the constituent bolt with the graphic representation of the parent bolt (col. 20 lines 55-65; col. 35 lines 40-59).

20. As per claim 17, Matoba teaches a method comprising of

providing an automated task list, including a parent action date component having an associated parent date property a child action date component having an associated child date property col. 35 lines 40-59);

the child action date component associated with the parent action date component an action component associated with an action date component in the bolt, the action component performing a pre-configured task when executed (col. 18 –lines 30-50; col. 17 lines 27 –56); and

leaving the value of date property as previously set if the date property is marked as a hard date, and executing each action component associated with the action date component based on the point in time specified in the date property of the action date component (col. 18 –lines 30-50; col. 17 lines 27 –40).

Miller teaches setting the date property of action date components in the bolt by iterating the bolt from parent action date component to child action date component and adding a offset value associated with the child action date to the value of the date property associated with the parent action date, wherein the offset value is either a positive or negative unit of time (col. 1 lines 47-52; col. 2 lines 5-9; col. 2 lines 58-61).

21. As per claim 18, Matoba teaches a method wherein the bolt further includes an action list component associated with an action date component and the action list component has at least one associated action component, the method further comprising executing each action component associated with the action list component when the action date component executes the action list component (col. 18 lines 31-64; col. 20 lines 55-65; col. 35 lines 40-59).

22. As per claim 19, Matoba teaches a method wherein the action date component selectively executes an associated action list component based on analysis of pre-configured conditions (col. 19 lines 15-45).

23. As per claim 20 Matoba teaches a method further comprising a graphical user interface that displays the automated task list as a bolt (col. 1 lines 47-52; col. 2 lines 5-9; col. 2 lines 58-61).

24. As per claim 21, Matoba teaches a method further, comprising a graphical user interface that displays the automated task list as a checklist (fig 44; col. 18 –lines 30-50; col. 17 lines 27 –40).

Response to Arguments

25. Applicant's arguments filed 5/13/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the

references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Matoba et al clearly teaches the use of automating a sequence of tasks with specific dates for tasks(col. 16 lines 55-66; col. 7 lines 38-55; col. 62 lines 30-48). Miller teaches the association of a component with another component includes making the component aware of the other component such that the component can access certain of the properties, methods or events associated with the other component (col. 1 lines 47-52; col. 2 lines 5-9; col. 2 lines 58-61). It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Miller and Matoba because Miller's method of updating information related each component and notifying the other component would improve Matoba system by allowing each component to know the status and other information about the other component.

Conclusion

26. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

Art Unit: 2195

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

27. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nilesh Shah whose telephone number is (571)272-3771. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Meng An can be reached on (571)272-3756.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Nilesh Shah
Examiner
Art Unit 2195

NS
July 29, 2005

MAJID BANANKHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER